

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-17 remain pending in the present application. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-6, 9 and 10 have been amended. Claims 13-17 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: S96 and S97 of Figure 10. Applicants have amended the specification to describe Figure 10 and reference characters S96 and S97. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ieda (U.S. Pat. No. 6,675,873). As described in the related art of the specification of the present application, conventionally, it is difficult for an air-conditioning ECU used for an engine vehicle to be used for a hybrid vehicle or an electrical vehicle without changing the hardware structure of the air-conditioning ECU.

In amended Claim 1 of the present invention, the output circuit (5b), that is capable of converting the target rotation speed input from the air-conditioning electronic control unit to a driving signal for processing the compressor inverter, is provided in the driving electronic control unit (5) which is different from the air-conditioning electronic control unit (7). Accordingly, only by providing the output circuit (5b) in a normal driving

electronic control unit for an engine vehicle, can an air-conditioning electronic control unit used for the engine vehicle can be used for a hybrid vehicle or an electric vehicle, without a hardware change of the air-conditioning electronic control unit.

None of the references cited by the Examiner disclose, teach or suggest the driving electronic control unit having an output circuit that is capable of converting the target rotation speed input from the air-conditioning electronic control unit to a driving signal for processing the compressor inverter and outputting the driving signal converted via the output circuit to the compressor inverter as is now defined in amended Claim 1.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 8, which depends from Claim 1, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of original Claim 6. Claim 6 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 10, with the added limitations of Claim 6, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwanami, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,986,645) in view of Tamegai (U.S. Pat. No. 6,287,081). Claims 2-4 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwanami, et al. in view of Tamegai in further view of Takahashi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,330,909). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwanami, et al. in view of Tamegai in further view of Takahashi and Inoue (U.S. Pat. No. 5,765,383). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwanami, et al. in view of Tamegai, et al. in further view of Takahashi and Yoshida (U.S. Pat. No. 5,441,122) and Kawashima (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,623).

The above discussion of Claim 1 applies here also. Iwanami fails to disclose, teach or suggest the driving electronic control unit having the output circuit defined in amended Claim 1. Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-5 and 8, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

As described above, Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 1 and is thus believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 11 and 12, which ultimately depend from Claim 10, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 6, 7 and 9 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 6 depended from Claim 1. Claim 6 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claim 1 and is thus believed to be allowable. Claim 7 depends from Claim 6.

Claim 9 depended from Claim 8 which depended from Claim 1. Claim 9 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claims 1 and 8 and is thus believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 7, 2006

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg